

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION**

PHYLLIS SCHLAFLY REVOCABLE
TRUST, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

ANNE CORI, et al.,

Defendants.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

Case No. 4:16-cv-01631-JAR

MEMORANDUM & ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiffs' motion to lift stay. (Doc. No. 101). On January 16, 2020, the Court held a hearing on the motion to lift stay and, following the hearing, the Individual Defendants,¹ with leave of the Court, filed their opposition to the motion. (Doc. No. 106). The Individual Defendants maintain that the ongoing nature of related lawsuits in various jurisdictions demonstrate that the risk of inconsistent rulings is greater today than when the Court first entered a stay in this case. The Individual Defendants further state that two of those related cases are set for trial in the foreseeable future: the St. Louis County probate case is set for trial on January 27, 2020, and the Madison County, Illinois case is set for trial on February 18, 2020. The Individual Defendants request that the stay remain in place until final resolution of all related litigation or, in the alternative, that the stay be extended to allow final judgments to be entered in the Madison County and St. Louis County probate cases.

The Court originally entered a stay in this case because the property and claims at issue in this litigation were also pending in other jurisdictions. After reviewing the parties' briefing on the issue, it

¹ The Individual Defendants include Anne Schlafly Cori, Eunie Smith, Cathie Adams, Carolyn McLarty, Rosina Kovar, and Shirley Curry, who are named Defendants in this action and represented by the same attorney.

appears to the Court that the Madison County and St. Louis probate cases still have a direct impact on the issues in this lawsuit. Specifically, the Madison County lawsuit involves a claim seeking a declaratory judgment regarding ownership of the Schlafly Database and other property. Ownership of Phyllis Schlafly's name, image, and likeness is central to the St. Louis County probate case. These issues overlap with issues before this Court. Moreover, it appears that the St. Louis County probate action could impact Plaintiffs' standing to bring certain claims in this litigation.

Thus, upon careful consideration, the Court will keep the stay in place for a short period of time. The Court believes that a short stay is appropriate and advances the interest of conserving judicial resources because the trials scheduled in the Madison County and St. Louis County probate cases bear on issues related to this case. Therefore, the stay continues to be appropriate, particularly because trials in those cases are imminent.


Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiffs' motion to lift stay (Doc. No. 101) is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this case shall remain **STAYED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, on or before **March 24, 2020**, Plaintiffs and Defendants shall each file a status report regarding all other related lawsuits.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties shall file a notice updating the Court of any judgments entered in the Madison County or St. Louis County probate case within **ten (10) days** of the entry of judgment.


JOHN A. ROSS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 24th day of January, 2020.